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ABSTRACT

Subjects from eight school districts in Central Virginia were surveyed. The sample included 73 secondary-school (grades 9 - 12) vocational education teachers from general academic public schools and 46 secondary (9 - 12 grades) special education teachers from public schools.

T-tests revealed significant differences in attitudes toward transition between the two groups. Special education teachers displayed significantly more awareness of transition goals, involvement in implementing these goals and increased communication about transition goals. Vocational education teachers indicated that they should attend the IEP meeting and have involvement in writing transition goals, but that they generally are not involved in either.

Transition training significantly influenced teachers' views. Teachers with previous training in transition indicated significantly more awareness of the IEP goals, more involvement in writing the goals and more communication with other professionals about students' transition goals.
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Introduction

Will (1984) reported that an estimated 250,000 youths with disabilities will leave public school annually. This number has increased tremendously since 1984. Virginia demographics for 1990-91 showed that 3,801 students, ages 14-22, receiving special education services exited school (Virginia Department of Education, 1993). Sixty percent of those exited with a diploma, 12% with a certificate of completion or an IEP diploma, 15% dropped out, and 11% were unknown (Virginia Department of Education, 1992).

Those students with specific learning disabilities (LD) seemed to experience greater postschool success than students with other disabilities (Hasazi, Gordon, & Roe, 1985; Virginia Department of Education, 1992; Wagner, 1989). Youth with learning disabilities, however, did not achieve the same degree of vocational success as their non-disabled peers (Wagner, 1990). Individuals with disabilities who drop out of school may enter the work force with few transition supports.

Case studies of four adults with learning disabilities who had dropped out of high school were conducted by Liechtenstein (1993). The study examined issues surrounding dropping out and their transition from youth to early
adulthood. The four young adults in this study were working while in high school, and some worked as early as middle school. The individuals located the jobs on their own and the jobs provided them with 30 to 40 hours of work per week. These positions required little supervision by adults. Three of the four subjects reported success in finding and keeping an appropriate job. Reports such as this suggested that special education students can successfully obtain and maintain jobs on their own. A study conducted by the National Council on Disability (1989), found that graduates with disabilities are more likely to be employed following school if a comprehensive vocational training program is in place throughout high school and a job is secured by the time of graduation. The transition services available to special education students are in place because of a variety of legal initiatives.

Legal Background

The passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EHA), P.L. 94-142, in 1975, mandated that Individualized Education Programs (IEP) be written for all children with disabilities found eligible for special education. Amendments to the EHA, now called Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), (P.L. 101-476), add a new component to the IEP. Beginning by age 16, or age 14 or younger when appropriate, each IEP must include a statement of the transition services necessary to prepare
for postschool outcomes, such as, employment, postsecondary education, adult services, independent living, and community participation [The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. Chapter 33, Section 1401 (a)(19)].

The term transition services has a very broad meaning due to the various areas of adulthood and difficulties special education students have reported encountering in postschool life. Difficulties in finding or keeping employment, poor integration into the community, lack of a social network, and lack of independence are among the difficulties these students have experienced (Hasazi, Gordon, & Roe, 1985). The National Information Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities (1993) report on transition, described transition services as defined by U.S. Department of Education (1992) as:

(a) . . . a coordinated set of activities for a student, designed within an outcome-oriented process, that promotes movement from school to post-school activities, including postsecondary education, vocational training, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living, or community participation.

(b) The coordinated set of activities . . . must-

(1) Be based upon the individual student’s needs, taking into account the
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student's preference and interests; and

(2) Include --

(i) Instruction

(ii) Community experiences;

(iii) The development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives; and


Federal legislation has attempted to meet the adjustment demands of the special education population; however, efforts are not effective unless there is coordination among the many individuals involved with the student (DeStefano & Wermuth, 1992). IDEA defines transition as a "coordinated set of activities." The National Information Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities (1993) defines coordinated as "(1) the linkage between each of the component activities that comprise transition services, and (2) the interrelationship between the various agencies that are involved in the provision of
transition services to a student" (U.S. Department of Education, 1992, p.44644).

These transition services are determined at an IEP meeting. IDEA is very clear as to which individuals should participate in determining the transition services required for a given student (National Information Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities, 1993). The usual participants of the IEP meeting, such as the student's teacher, a school representative, and the parents are to be invited as well as a representative from the public agency providing the service and the student. IDEA requires that the IEP include "... a statement of each public agency's . . . responsibility or linkages, or both, before the student leaves the school setting" [300.346(b)(1)].

Specific vocational education for students with disabilities required by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1990 includes services to assist students in school-to-work transition, in order to provide supplementary services and facilitate transition from school to postschool employment. The majority of the Carl D. Perkins basic grant is distributed to local school districts and postsecondary programs. This grant requires that 70% of students enrolled in vocational education programs must be economically disadvantaged and 20% of those enrolled have disabilities.
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Another piece of legislation affecting transition services is The Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1986 (PL 99-506). These amendments to the original Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (PL 93-112) focused on improving independent living opportunities, client rights, and supported employment opportunities.

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (PL 101-336) is often considered a civil rights law for all people with disabilities. This legislation provides regulations for accessibility and nondiscrimination in places of employment and housing. These regulations should promote an easier transition for individuals with disabilities into the workplace.

Vocational Teachers' Involvement in IEP Development

Concern arose about the development of Individualized Transition Plans (ITP) and the implementation of policy to integrate transition planning in IEPs (Repetto, White & Snaeuwaert, 1990; Defur, Getzel & Kregel, 1994). In the Spring of 1993, UNified Intercommunity Transition and Empowerment (Project UNITE) was initiated in Virginia to assess integration of transition services in IEPs and the outcomes of youth with learning disabilities who participated in this process (Defur et al., 1994). The authors found that special education teachers and administrators constituted most of the participants of the IEP team. Vocational
educators, on the other hand, were present at only 6% of the identified meetings (Defur et al., 1994). Employment goals were generally not included in the IEPs of students in grades 8-10, but were considered more often in grades 11 and 12. The authors found that school personnel could benefit from training on transition planning, developing goals, and their role in the transition process (Defur, et al., 1994).

According to Sitlington and Okolo (1987) vocational educators rarely consulted with other professionals regarding their students with disabilities and vocational educators believed they had little control over the placement of students in their program. As a result, questions arose about vocational teachers' involvement in the IEP process. In a survey of vocational instructors, Albright & Preskill (1982) found that vocational teachers are rarely involved in development of the IEP. According to Richmond (1985), some vocational home economics teachers had a general knowledge of the IEP, but participate very little in its development. Green et al. (1991) suggested that vocational education teachers should utilize special needs teachers to assist in modifying vocational instructional materials and individualizing instruction for special education students mainstreamed in vocational classes. Although legislation mandates that a public agency provider, the
parent(s), and the special education teacher be invited to the IEP meeting, involvement of the vocational education teacher is not mentioned.

Federal legislation states that a "coordinated set of activities" must be provided for the transition of special needs students. According to many studies (Sitlington and Okolo, 1987; Richmond, 1984; Szymanski, Hanley-Maxwell, & Asselin, 1992) the vocational education teacher was somewhat aware of transition goals but was rarely involved in the development of these transition goals. Likewise, special education teachers were often not involved in the vocational training of their students. Cooperation and communication between special educators and vocational educators about the transition process is infrequent.

The attitudes of teachers towards individuals with disabilities in their classroom may affect the quality instruction and the students' success in the class. Claxton (1986) believed that vocational educators involvement in the IEP process should increase positive attitudes towards instructing students with special needs. However, Asselin (1982) reported that in-service sessions may have improved knowledge of the content, but attitudes toward special needs students remained the same.
A study was conducted by Sitlington and Okolo (1987) to determine vocational educators' educational and experiential background, their involvement with learners with disabilities, and their attitudes regarding learners with disabilities. The Indiana sample consisted of vocational teachers who had an average of 15 years experience. This study found that 38% had not received training to work with students with disabilities, but vocational educators expressed strong positive attitudes toward inclusion of students with disabilities in their programs. Enrollment of disabled students in vocational programs was low despite positive teacher attitudes. One quarter of the sample stated that they had not instructed a disabled learner in the past three years.

Krom and Prater (1993) examined IEP annual goals of intermediate students with mild mental retardation and compared those goals with subjects and content taught. Most of the annual goals were in academic areas while few goals addressed vocational areas; however, almost all of the students were receiving instruction in non-academic areas (Krom & Prater, 1993). Stowitschek and Kelso (1989) feared the same mistake would be made in writing transition goals and failing to provide transition service or vice versa, that is, providing services and not writing appropriate goals.
Special Educators' Involvement in Transition

The primary function of the special education teacher, in the transition process, is to develop the IEP and assume responsibility for transition planning. The special education teacher also acts as a resource to answer the vocational instructor's questions and concerns (Johnson & Atkins, 1986).

Halpern and Benz (1984) studied secondary special education practices in Oregon and found that about 25% of the teachers surveyed were not involved with vocational education. A disagreement existed over who should coordinate vocational and special education services. On the survey, only 30% of special educators felt that the coordination of transition services was their responsibility, whereas 60% of the administrators surveyed indicated it is special educators' responsibility (Halpern & Benz, 1984). This suggested a lack of communication about the responsibilities of the special education teacher in the area of transition.

Vocational and Special Educators' Cooperative Efforts in Transition

The vocational educator is skilled in instruction of job skills within a specific area and knows the job market demands for entry level work in the field. The vocational teacher may not have had specific training in working with students with disabilities; therefore,
cooperation between the special education teacher and vocational educator may facilitate ease in transition planning. These "key players" in the transition process must work together as an interdisciplinary team to promote successful outcomes of individuals with disabilities (Johnson & Atkins, 1987).

The concept of transition from school to work is complicated (Johnson & Atkins, 1987). Those involved in transition planning should understand the roles and responsibilities of other members in the transition process, in order to facilitate successful employment outcomes. Vocational rehabilitation acts as a link between special education and vocational education to monitor and prepare and maintain the individual in employment. Many authors considered special education and the secondary school programs to be the cornerstone of the transition process (Brown et al., 1982; Will, 1984).

Lombard and Hazelkorn (1993) reported that Wisconsin teachers used a state-sponsored transition model called Designated Vocational Instruction (DVI). In this program teachers attended a semester of graduate training courses to provide special needs students with opportunities in vocational education and/or technology preparation programs related to their interests. A higher pass rate occurred in special needs students when vocational and
special education teachers maintain cooperation (i.e., communicate on a regular basis about the progress of mutual students). Vocational teachers who worked with special needs students without the help of the special educator noticed a higher rate of failure among special needs students (Lombard & Hazelkorn, 1993). Commitment to cooperation between members of the transition team helps promote successful outcomes for students with mild disabilities.

Many studies showed that communication and cooperation among the individuals involved in providing transition services increased the effectiveness of the plans. Spencer-Dobson and Schultz (1985) conducted a survey of effectiveness of multidisciplinary teams and found that vocational educators rated administrative support for in-service and preparation time as necessary elements of team effectiveness. Gilles (1987) found that when instructional support and vocational planning were in place, fewer special needs students failed or dropped out. Other researchers have found that in-services for vocational educators improved their ability to serve special needs students (Seale, 1984; Shiver, 1985). Wircenski and Just (1984), on the other hand, found that vocational teachers felt they had adequate ability to serve and instruct disadvantaged students appropriately without additional training.
Coordination between special educators and vocational educators is necessary to provide the full range of transition services and to promote future success necessary for students with LD. To optimize the joint venture, special education teachers need to use their expertise in instruction of job-related academic and interpersonal skills in order to prepare students for entry into vocational programs. Vocational educators then demonstrate their expertise in job-specific skills instruction and knowledge of the labor market. Unfortunately, a comprehensive secondary transition effort is the exception, not the rule (Okolo & Sitlington, 1988).

Repetto and Phelps (1992) described an interdisciplinary personnel preparation program, the Leadership Development Program (LDP). This program was designed for secondary vocational education systems, high schools, special education departments, community colleges, and rehabilitation agencies. The goal of this successful program was to improve and expand the transition and vocational education programs for special needs students in the state of Illinois. The success of this program was attributed to developing individualized solutions for the arising needs in transition and teaming individuals from various disciplines. These teams were generally comprised of a special educator, a vocational
Because of the high demands of vocational classes, such as high-level reading in textbooks and assignments, and non-individualized group instruction and lecture format, the need for collaboration between special education and vocational education teachers is critical. A study of the instructional setting demands (textbooks used, lecture format, and assignment of work) and teacher expectations in vocational education classes as opposed to those in general education classes was conducted by Evers and Bursuck (1993). Results indicated that a significant difference in setting demands across general education and vocational education teachers did not exist. No significant difference was found in the use of textbooks, lecture as instruction, or assignment of independent work. Evers and Bursuck (1993) reported that the structure and demands of vocational and general academic classes are similar in many ways. Both academic and vocational teachers employ large-group lecture formats and use standard textbooks and both have a common perception of school survival skills and related problematic behaviors. Both vocational and regular educators have similar goals for attendance, punctuality, and organization (Evers & Bursuck, 1993). Vocational classes do not accommodate for individual differences and
students with disabilities may have problems similar to those displayed in the regular education classroom. Problems such as note taking, reading and comprehending difficult material, and following oral directions are common in vocational classes as well as the regular education classes.

Zigmond, Kerr, & Schaeffer (1988) contended that students exhibiting deficits in reading, writing and listening in regular education classrooms, may encounter the same difficulties in vocational education classes. Evers and Bursuck (1993) also concluded that students with LD who have reading, writing, and listening difficulties in the regular education class would demonstrate the same problems in the vocational education class and continue to be unsuccessful.

**Teachers' Perceptions of Responsibility**

The literature suggests that teachers agree as to the instruction needed for special needs students, but often see other professionals as unwilling to take responsibility for the instruction. Bain and Farris (1991) investigated the attitudes of secondary teachers from urban schools toward teaching social skills. They found that teachers suggested social skills training could improve student-teacher relations, the school environment, and the behavior of students at school; assist students in vocational areas; and improve
communication with peers (Bain & Farris, 1991). When asked about responsibility of social skills instruction and the rate at which other staff were involved, respondents indicated that their peers were less willing to participate. Teachers also reported concern about their ability to implement social skills training due to lack of training.

Special and vocational education teachers should be informed as to the role public agencies play in transition. Plue (1985) studied public school vocational education programs for the mildly mentally retarded in Mississippi. Most of the special education teachers in the population were responsible for vocational instruction of individuals with mental retardation. Special educators from urban schools reported a positive availability of vocational instructional materials, while suburban and rural teachers were split 50/50 in their views of availability of curriculum materials. Teachers in urban districts were found to be more comfortable with involvement of "service" agencies (e.g., vocational agencies) than suburban and rural districts. Plue (1985) stated that teachers and other school personnel may not be fully aware of vocational agencies and the services they provide. Awareness of vocational education programs and proper teacher training were identified as major problems with programs.
Okolo and Sitlington (1988) discussed types of services which can facilitate the transition process of students with a learning disability. Deficiencies in interpersonal skills, such as work habits and attitudes and communication skills, as well as job-related academic skills, were considered reasons for underemployment of the mildly handicapped. Although vocational education can provide specific vocational skill training, it does not systematically address the work habits and attitudes that are equally critical to employment success (Sitlington, 1981). Attempts have been made to identify and categorize affective work competencies necessary for successful employment. The School Transition to Employment Partnership (STEP) curriculum included such competencies.

Statement of Purpose

Research has supported the need for an increased emphasis on transition services. Federal legislation and increased authorizations and appropriations of state and federal dollars towards transitional services has produced more demands and expectations on teachers involved with the special needs student. These initiatives are intended to promote more effective transition planning and coordination among professionals. Are professionals fully aware of and prepared for their roles and responsibilities in the transition process?
This study examines this question as well as others. Current research does not address the attitudes of special and vocational educators towards the responsibility of implementing these mandated transition goals. This research will focus on individuals perceptions of transition goals.

The following questions will be examined in this research study:

1. Are special education and vocational education teachers aware of their responsibilities in the transition process?

2. How do vocational education teachers perceive the responsibility of implementing transition goals?

3. Have vocational education teachers received training in transitional planning?

4. Does previous formal education or in-service training of vocational instructors affect their perceptions of responsibility of transition goals?
Subjects were selected from eight school districts in Central Virginia. The sample included 73 secondary-school (grades 9-12) vocational education teachers from general academic public schools and 46 secondary (9-12 grades) special education teachers from public schools.

The sample of special educators included teachers from all three areas: mildly mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, and learning disabled. The majority of special education teachers surveyed were female (75%), while only 25% of the special educator sample were male. Over half (61%) of the special educators had received master's degrees and 39% had received bachelor's degrees (see Appendix A). Fifty-nine percent of the special education teachers had taught for less than 10 years and 41% had 10 or more years of experience.

The sample of vocational education teachers included an almost even distribution of males and females (almost 50/50). Several of the vocational educators (6.5%) had not received a degree, 9.1% held vocational education certificates, 51.9% received bachelor of arts or sciences degrees, 27.3% received master of arts or sciences degrees and 1.3% (1 respondent) held a doctorate degree. Slightly over half (51.4%) of the vocational educators
had 1-9 years of teaching experience, while the balance (48.6%) had taught for 10 or more years (see Appendix A).

Seventy-three percent of the special education and 74% of the vocational education sample identified their districts as rural. Part or all of the subjects from county 5, 4, 1 and 2 identified their school district as urban/suburban. County 5 was the only city school division sampled. With the exception of urban/suburban localities, this is a good representation of Central Virginia.

Instrument

A survey instrument was developed to assess special education and vocational education teachers' views of transition training as affected by training in transition (see Appendix B). The instrument contained three parts: (a) descriptive information, (b) transition training, and, (c) personal attitudes on transition services. The survey measured awareness of teachers' responsibility in the transition process, perceptions of teachers' responsibility in implementing transition goals, transition training received and the impact training has on teacher attitudes towards involvement in transition planning.

Six forced-choice questions pertaining to transition planning training offered and/or participated in follow the descriptive questions. This section of the survey
attempted to determine whether or not transition training is available to special education and vocational education teachers. How the training was conducted, such as through a college course or an in-service constitutes one question in part two of the survey. Identification of those conducting transitional training, such as college professors, school faculty, or vocational agencies was the focus of another question in this section. Another item questioned educators about who was invited to transition training, for example, special education teachers, vocational education teachers, regular education teachers, school counselors, and others. The personal views the educators about the age transition goals should be included in the IEP was contained in the final question of section two.

Educators' personal attitudes of transition planning were measured using 20 Likert-type statements. Each statement measuring views on vocational and special education teachers' involvement in transition planning was followed by numbers 1 through 5. The participants responded to each statement by selecting the level which most accurately measures their attitude or involvement: 1 = never, 2 = seldom, 3 = sometimes, 4 = usually, 5 = always.

Pilot Test

The instrument and a cover letter (see Appendices B
and C) were distributed by hand to a small sample of vocational and special education trainers or trainees. These respondents rated the readability and clarity of the instrument. Deficiencies as well as suggestions for improvements were identified in this field test. After reviewing the comments and responses to the piloted survey, modifications were made in format and clarity of the instrument and cover letter.

Procedure

Permission to survey in the school districts was obtained from the appropriate administrative office of the respective school districts. The letter requesting permission to survey can be found in Appendix D. For the subjects in five counties, the self-administered Likert-scale survey was mailed to subjects identified by their school district. Three counties either requested a specific number of surveys to distribute (ensuring anonymity) or copied the survey themselves and distributed them to their special education and vocational education teachers. The cover letter explained the study and assured complete anonymity and confidentiality. A specific deadline of three weeks for response was included in the letter. A stamped, addressed return envelope was provided with the survey to encourage response.

Surveys were sent to teachers identified by
personnel responsible for approving research in eight Central Virginia counties. A total of 183 surveys were sent to teachers and 120 surveys (66 percent) were returned (see Appendix E). The number of surveys sent to special education teachers and the number of those returned is shown in Appendix F. The response rate for the sample of special education teachers ranged from 60% (county 7) to 100% (county 8). The number of surveys sent to vocational education teachers and the number returned is presented in Appendix G. The response rate for the sample of vocational education teachers ranged from 33% (county 3 county 8) to 83% (county 7). To ensure complete anonymity and confidentiality, the counties are being identified by numbers throughout this paper.
Results

Transition Training Offered to Special and Vocational Instructors

A comparison of vocational and special education teachers' responses on the transition training questions revealed a significant difference in availability of training between the two groups (see Appendix H). When asked if they had been offered transition training, 78% of the special education teachers responded "yes", while only 30% of the vocational education teachers responded "yes". The majority (70%) of vocational educators had never been offered training in the transition of students from school to work. Of the special educators who indicated that they had been offered training, 100% participated in the training. Of the vocational educators who had been offered training, 95% participated in the training.

Of the sample of vocational and special education teachers, 73% indicated on the survey that they teach in a rural district, while 27% of the subjects indicated they teach in an urban or suburban district. As indicated in Appendix I, about half the rural teachers were offered training in transition and half had never been offered training. Of the urban/suburban teachers, there were 12% more teachers who had never been offered training than those who had been offered training.
When asked how many training courses/inservices the special educators had participated in, 31% responded "1", 28% responded "3", 22% responded "2", 6% responded "4", 6% responded "6", and 3% responded "8" and "10 or more". When vocational educators were asked how many courses/inservices they had participated in, 24% responded "2", 14% responded "3", 10% responded "1", 10% responded "5", 10% responded "6", and 10% responded "many" and only 5% responded "4".

Of those vocational educators who participated in transition training, 47% indicated that a college professor was responsible for the training. A school faculty member was noted as responsible by 31% of those vocational educators who participated in training, while a vocational agency conducted the training for 22% of the respondents. Special educators responded quite differently to this question. Vocational agencies were identified as being responsible for conducting transition training by 48% of the special educators. Eleven special education teachers, 24%, indicated that college professors conducted the training and 17% reported a school faculty member conducted the training.

When asked who was invited to transitional training, 36% of vocational teachers who participated in training indicated that vocational education teachers were invited. Twenty-one percent suggested that special
education teachers were invited, 18% indicated that regular education teachers and 18% of the responses suggested school counselors were invited.

Special education teachers indicated that they are most frequently involved in the transition training, 41%. Vocational educators were indicated by 21% of the responses as being invited while school counselors were noted by 17% as being invited and only 6% suggested regular education teachers were invited.

The mean age that vocational education teachers felt transition goals should be included in the IEP was 14.6; with a range from 10 to 16 years of age and 15 as the mode. Special educators indicated a mean of 14.2 years with a range from 5 years to 16 years and 16 as the mode.

**Vocational and Special Education Teachers' Responses on Survey Questions**

Independent samples t-tests were used to compare the survey responses of vocational teachers against those of special education teachers. This statistical technique revealed significant mean differences between vocational and special educators on the attitude and involvement measures. A .05 significance level was used to determine significant differences between the groups.

Appendix J shows the mean scores on each of the survey questions of the special education teachers and the vocational education teachers. When asked about teachers
awareness of the transition goals in the Individualized Education Plan (question 2), special education teachers responded significantly higher than vocational education teachers ($t = -12.75; p < .001$). Special educators also responded nearly 3 points higher ($t = -21.51; p < .001$) when asked (question 3) about their involvement in writing IEP transition goals. Special educators also indicated significantly ($t = -7.36; p < .001$) more communication with other teachers about transition goals (question 4). When asked if transition goals should be included in the goals of all high school students, special educators responded significantly higher ($t = -2.36; p < .05$); although, both groups revealed a high mean. Special education teachers indicated that vocational teachers should have more involvement in writing transition goals (question 8), whereas vocational education teachers responded that they should "usually" be involved in developing transition goals ($t = -2.61; p < .01$). Special education teachers responded higher than vocational education teachers ($t = -2.68; p < .01$) to the statement about the implementation of transition goals being "primarily the responsibility of the special education teacher" (question 10). Both special and vocational teachers indicated in question 18 that training should be offered, but the responses of special educators were higher ($t = -2.98; p < .01$). Special
educators indicated in question 19 that transition training influences communication with other professionals significantly more ($t = -2.81; p < .01$) than vocational educators.

**Effects of Training on Transition Attitudes**

A second series of $t$-tests of independent means were used to compare teachers who indicated that they had participated in transition training to those who had never participated in transition training on the Likert questions. A significant difference between the two groups was found for 9 questions (see Appendix K).

Trained teachers responded stronger to the statement that teachers are models ($t = 2.16; p < .05$). Trained teachers also indicated ($t = 5.02; p < .001$) that they were more often aware of transition goals (question 2) than teachers with no previous training in transition. In question three, trained teachers indicated more involvement in writing transition goals ($t = 6.39; p < .001$); and in question four they indicated a greater degree of communication with other teachers about transition goals ($t = 4.19; p < .001$). Trained teachers felt more strongly that transition goals should be included in the IEP of high school students in question 6 ($t = 2.48; p < .05$). In question 13, trained teachers responded more often that vocational agency representatives should be invited to the IEP meeting
(t = 2.53; p < .05). Teachers with previous training in transition also indicated (question 14) more often that vocational teachers attend the IEP meeting (t = 2.19; p < .05). Trained teachers responded more strongly than non-trained teachers, in question 18, (t = 2.86; p < .01) that training should be offered to all special and vocational education teachers. In question 20, trained teachers responded significantly higher (t = 6.38; p < .001) than non-trained teachers when asked if transition training included training in communication with other professionals.
Discussion

This study provided a comparison of special education teachers and vocational education teachers on the issue of transition from school to work. As expected, a much greater percentage of special education teacher had received transition training (78%) than had vocational teachers (30%). Special education teachers had received training primarily by in-services conducted by vocational agencies. One possible reason vocational agencies offer more training may be their involvement with the special education population. Whereas, college courses were indicated more often by vocational educators as training sites for transition issues. College courses offered for vocational teachers would contain information on school to work transition appropriate for the content area. Since a larger percentage of special education teachers reported having a master's degree than vocational education teachers, they may also have had more opportunity to participate in transition training.

The survey leaves room for the subjects to respond to how many in-services/courses the subjects participated in and how the training was conducted (college course, in-service, other) as well as who conducted the training (professor, faculty, vocational agency, other). Many subjects recorded that they had participated in a 2-10 training courses, but may have indicated only one or two
selections for the items "how was the training conducted?" and "who conducted the training?". Because of this flaw in the survey, it is difficult to determine how the training was conducted and who conducted the training. For future use, it is recommended that the survey be modified to request the number of times training was offered in a college course, in-service and other; and who conducted the training for each course. This modification would allow for more conclusive results about the characteristics of transition training.

A much higher percentage of special education teachers had obtained higher than a bachelor's degree. While participating in a greater number of academic classes, the sample of special educators may have received more training in transition. The exact percentage of training offered in college courses, in-service, or other cannot be determined with this study. The previously mentioned modification would direct subjects to indicate the number of college courses and in-services participated in as well as who conducted each and who was invited to each.

Overall, the majority of both special education and vocational education teachers (73%) indicated that they taught in a rural district. As Appendix I indicates, about 50% of the rural teacher had been offered training in transition; whereas, only 44% of urban/suburban
teachers had been offered training. Although urban/suburban areas may have more resources and appropriate trainers, these areas appear to offer fewer opportunities in transition training. A urban, special education teacher commented that transition training "needs to be much more in depth, especially for LD/ED students." On the other hand, the need for transition training may seem more urgent in rural settings due to decreased vocational opportunities in these localities. This finding should not be generalized due to the small sample of urban/suburban school districts.

The survey contains 20-Likert statements with responses of "never", "seldom", "sometimes", "usually", or "always." Appendix J and Appendix K include the subjects mean responses as well as t-values and significance levels. The levels of significance are included on the Appendices ($p < .10$, $p < .05$, $p < .01$, and $p < .001$).

Vocational education teachers responded that they were "seldom" to "sometimes" aware of transition goals whereas, special education teachers responded that they were "usually" to "always" aware of transition goals on the Individualized Education Plan (IEP). Special education teachers generally write the IEP and therefore, should be aware of the goals; but, goals often include instruction in vocational education. These results
indicate that vocational educators are generally not aware of their special education students’ transition goals. Scheduling problems may be one cause for this lack of communication between special education and vocational education teachers. Several respondents indicated that finding time for additional meetings and consultation would be difficult. One vocational educator commented that "special education instructors should continue to specialize in IEP development and implementation with technical and vocational support provided by vocational instructors." Another vocational educator indicated in writing that modification of the present teaching situation is necessary to facilitate transition.

Both special educators and vocational educators agreed that vocational teachers should "usually" to "always" attend the IEP meeting for vocational students and that communication between special education and vocational teachers is "usually" to "always" necessary. Special educators indicated that vocational teachers should be involved in writing transition goals, while vocational educators indicated less frequently that their involvement was necessary. Several special educators commented that vocational educators should be involved in IEP meetings for students receiving vocational education but "this is not the policy of our division." Another
special educator indicated that vocational teachers should always attend the IEP meeting for students receiving vocational services but, in "actuality this never happens." Whereas, a vocational educator felt that "vocational teachers... are not adequately trained to have 'special' students mainstreamed... but rarely is there any consideration (for additional needs) when these children are placed in (vocational) classes." In addition to time constraints, the organizational structure of the division may also produce a barrier to communication between vocational and special education teachers. Distance between vocational centers and high schools may decrease the opportunity for communication between vocational and special education teachers and joint involvement in development of transition goals.

Training did appear to have an impact on the perception of transition. The percentage of the special education sample that had received training was much higher (80%) than the percentage of vocational sample that had received training (30%). Of those teachers that had received training, 62% were special education teachers, while only 38% of trained teachers were vocational education teachers. This comparison of trained and untrained teachers may over-represent special education teachers. Trained teachers reported that they were "usually" aware of transition goals in the IEP,
whereas teachers without transition training reported that they were "sometimes" aware of the same goals. As indicated earlier, special educators may have inflated this score.

Teachers with previous training were much more involved in writing transition goals and communicated more often about transition goals than teachers with no training. Again, this statistic may indicate a difference between vocational and special education teachers rather than trained and untrained teachers. Because special educators are responsible for writing IEP goals and communicating to other special education teachers regardless of training, they would respond similarly to how the trained teachers responded.

Both special and vocational teachers felt that transition goals should be written for special education students in vocational classes. It can be argued that special education students are not helped by having transitional goals unless the vocational teacher is aware of the goals and helps the students attain the goals. Results indicated that vocational educators feel they should be involved in writing vocational goals and attending IEP meeting, but that the primary responsibility lies with the special education teacher.

Vocational and special education teachers also felt that training in transition should be offered to all
special and vocational teachers. The need for training was emphasized by many subjects with additional comments on the survey.
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DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION OF SUBJECTS

(By Percentage)
Appendix A
Demographic Information of Subjects (by percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>Vocational Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees Obtained</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc. Ed. Cert.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS/BA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS/MA</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. D.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grades Taught</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

INSTRUMENT
TRANSITION SURVEY

I. Check one blank for each statement/question.

Gender: ___ Male  ___ Female

Degree(s) obtained: ____________________________

I teach: ___ Vocational Education
          ___ Special Education

If you teach Special Education:
  what area (e.g. ED, MR, LD);
  specify severity if appropriate: ______________

If you teach Vocational Education, what area:
  ___ Trade, Industrial, and Technical
  ___ Consumer and Homemaking Education
  ___ Business Education

Grade level you teach:  ___ 9  ___ 10  ___ 11  ___ 12

County/city ______________

Number of years you have taught this subject:
  ___ 1-2  ___ 3-5  ___ 5-7  ___ 7-10  ___ 10 or more

Type of school district you teach in: ___ rural
                                      ___ urban
                                      ___ suburban

II. Respond to the following questions using this definition of transition.

Transition is individualized planning for a student designed to promote movement from school to post-school employment.

Have you been offered training in transition planning?
  ___ yes  ___ no

If you answered "yes":
  Did you participate in the training?  ___ yes  ___ no

  How many courses/inservices have you participated in?  _____

  How was the training conducted?  ___ college course
                                      ___ in-service
                                      _______ (other)
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Who conducted the training?  
___ college professor  
___ faculty member  
___ specify position  
___ vocational agency  
___ other

Who was invited to the training? Check all that apply.  
___ special education teachers  
___ vocational education teachers  
___ regular education teachers  
___ school counselors  
___ others (specify)

Transition goals should be included in the IEP by age ___.

III. Circle the appropriate number for each item. Respond to each item using the definition of transition and your present teaching situation.

1. It is my responsibility to instruct the students in my classes about appropriate job-related behaviors.  
Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Usually  Always

2. I am fully aware of transition goals written in the Individualized Education Plan (IEP).  
Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Usually  Always

3. I am involved in writing the transition goals in the IEP.  
Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Usually  Always

4. I communicate with the special education/vocational education teacher about special education students' transition goals.  
Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Usually  Always

5. It is necessary for transition goals to be included in the IEP of all middle school special education students.  
Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Usually  Always
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6. It is necessary for transition goals to be included in the IEP of all high school special education students.
   Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Usually  Always
   1      2      3      4      5

7. Transition goals should be written for students in vocational education classes who do not receive special education services.
   Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Usually  Always
   1      2      3      4      5

8. Vocational education teachers should be involved in the formation of transition goals.
   Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Usually  Always
   1      2      3      4      5

9. Vocational education teachers should attend the IEP meeting for students taking vocational classes.
   Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Usually  Always
   1      2      3      4      5

10. It is primarily the responsibility of the special education teacher to see that transition goals are implemented.
    Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Usually  Always
    1      2      3      4      5

11. Teachers are models of appropriate job-related behaviors.
    Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Usually  Always
    1      2      3      4      5

12. Teachers who are consistently late and unwilling to abide by school policies are role modeling poor on-the-job behaviors for students.
    Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Usually  Always
    1      2      3      4      5

13. It is necessary to invite a representative from the local vocational agency to the IEP meeting.
    Never  Seldom  Sometimes  Usually  Always
    1      2      3      4      5
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. It is expected that the vocational teacher attend the IEP meeting for students receiving vocational services.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I feel it is unnecessary for vocational teachers to be involved in writing transition goals for students taking vocational education classes.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I feel it is unnecessary for special education teachers to be involved in writing transition goals for students taking vocational education classes.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I feel it is necessary for special education teachers and vocational education teachers to confer continuously about special education students' progress.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Training on transition goals should be offered to all special and vocational education teachers.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Transition training influences the amount of time I spend communicating with other professionals about specific students progress on transition goals.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The transition training I received included training in communication with other professionals.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COVER LETTER TO SUBJECTS
Dear

I am conducting a study on transitional planning of students with disabilities. I am interested in the views of vocational education teachers and special education teachers.

Enclosed is a survey that will only take 10 to 15 minutes for you to complete. After completing the survey, please seal it in the enclosed addressed, stamped return envelope. Please return the survey by March 1, 1995.

Your voluntary participation in this study is valued and appreciated. My research will not be complete without your sincere response. Your responses will be anonymous and completely confidential.

Sincerely,

Cindy Driver
Master’s candidate
Appendix D

LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION TO SURVEY
Dear

I am conducting a study on transitional planning of students with disabilities for my master's thesis. I am interested in the views of vocational education teachers and special education teachers. My research involves a short survey to high school vocational educators and special educators.

Enclosed is a survey for your review. Confidentiality and anonymity of all subjects is insured. I would appreciate your permission to survey vocational and special education teachers of your school system. If interested, I will notify you of the results of this study.

Your participation is valued and appreciated.

Sincerely,

Cindy Driver
Master's candidate
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SURVEY RESPONSE
### Survey Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Surveys Sent</th>
<th>Surveys Returned</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response Rate of 66%**

**Surveys Sent and Returned by County**
Appendix F

SPECIAL EDUCATION SURVEY RESPONSE
Special Education Survey Response

Counties

Number of Surveys

Sent

Returned

County

1

2

3

5

6

7

8
Appendix G

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SURVEY RESPONSE
Vocational Education Survey Response

Counties: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8

- Sent
- Returned

Number of Surveys

- County 2 has the highest number of surveys sent (40) and returned (28).
- County 5 has the second highest number of surveys sent (30) and returned (20).
- Counties 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 have lower numbers of surveys sent and returned.
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TRANSITION TRAINING OFFERED

(By Percentage)
Transition Training Offered

**By Percentage**

- **Special Ed. Teachers**
  - Offered: 78%
  - Not Offered: 22%

- **Vocational Teachers**
  - Offered: 30%
  - Not Offered: 70%

**By Percentage**
Appendix I

TYPE OF DISTRICT OFFERING TRAINING
Type of District Offering Training

- Rural*: 51% Offered Training, 49% Not Offered Training
- Urban/Suburban**: 44% Offered Training, 56% Not Offered Training

*Rural n=87  **Urban/Suburban n=32
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MEAN SCORES OF VOCATIONAL TEACHERS AND
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS ON SURVEY QUESTIONS
## Mean Scores of Vocational Teachers and Special Education Teachers on Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Vocational Teachers Mean</th>
<th>Special Teacher Mean</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
<th>Signif Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers as models.</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aware of IEP transition goals.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>-12.75</td>
<td>p&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Involvement in writing transition goals.</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>-21.51</td>
<td>p&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communication about transition goals.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>-7.36</td>
<td>p&lt;.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Transition goals should be included in IEP of middle school students.</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transition goals should be included in IEP of all high school students.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>p &lt; .05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Transition goals should be written for voc. ed. students.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vocational teachers should be involved in writing transition goals.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>-2.61</td>
<td>p &lt; .01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Vocational teachers should attend IEP.</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Special ed. teacher is responsible for goals.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>-2.68</td>
<td>p &lt; .01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teachers model job-related behaviors.</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Irresponsible teachers model poor behaviors.</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Perceptions of Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Mean 3.45</th>
<th>Mean 3.69</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Vocational agency rep. should be invited to IEP.</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>p &lt; .05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Vocational teachers attend IEP meetings.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>-2.41</td>
<td>p &lt; .05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Vocational teacher should not be involved in writing transition goals.</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Special ed. teachers need not be involved in writing transition goals.</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Communication between spec. ed. and voc. ed is necessary.</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Training should be offered to all special. ed. and voc. ed. teachers.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>-2.98</td>
<td>p &lt; .01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Transition training influences my communication with other teachers.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>-2.81</td>
<td>p &lt; .01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Transition training included communication training.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These mean scores were based on a scale of 1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always.
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MEAN SCORES OF TEACHERS WITH TRAINING IN TRANSITION AND TEACHERS WITH NO TRANSITION TRAINING ON SURVEY QUESTIONS
### Mean Scores of Teachers

With Training in Transition and Teachers With No Transition Training on Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY QUESTIONS</th>
<th>TRAINED TEACHERS MEANS n=58</th>
<th>NO TRAINING MEANS n=61</th>
<th>T-VALUE</th>
<th>SIGNIF LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers as models.</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>p &lt; .05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aware of IEP transition goals.</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>p &lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Involvement in writing transition goals.</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>p &lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communication about transition goals.</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>p &lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Transition goals should be included in IEP of middle school students.</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transition goals should be included in IEP of all high school students.</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>p &lt; .05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Transition goals should be written for voc. ed. students.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vocational teachers should be involved in writing transition goals.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Vocational teachers should attend IEP.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Special ed. teacher is responsible for goals.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teachers model job-related behaviors.</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Irresponsible teachers model poor behaviors.</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PERCEPTIONS OF TRANSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean 1</th>
<th>Mean 2</th>
<th>Mean 3</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Vocational agency rep. should be invited to IEP.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>p &lt; .05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Vocational teachers attend IEP meetings.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>p &lt; .05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Vocational teacher should not be involved in writing transition goals.</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Special ed. teachers need not be involved in writing transition goals.</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Communication between spec. ed. and voc. ed is necessary.</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Training should be offered to all special. ed. and voc. ed. teachers.</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>p &lt; .01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Transition training influences my communication with other teachers.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Transition training included communication training.</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>p &lt; .001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These mean scores were based on a scale of 1 = Never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Usually, 5 = Always.